



**UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
Patent and Trademark Office**

Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS
Washington, D.C. 20231

SW

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------

09/298,926 04/26/99 REMBOLD

H R.33554

EXAMINER

QM02/0915

RONALD E GREIGG
GRIEGG & GREIGG P.L.L.C.
1423 POWHATAN STREET
UNIT ONE
ALEXANDRIA VA 22314

MILLER, C

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

3747

10

DATE MAILED:

09/15/00

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/298,926

Applicant(s)

Examiner

Miller

Group Art Unit

3747

—The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet beneath the correspondence address—

Period for Response

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR RESPONSE IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a response be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for response specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a response within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for response is specified above, such period shall, by default, expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to respond within the set or extended period for response will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).

Status

- ☐ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 6/20/00
- ☐ This action is **FINAL**.
- ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, **prosecution as to the merits is closed** in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11; 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- ☐ Claim(s) 1-25 is/are pending in the application.
- ☐ Of the above claim(s) 20-21 and 25 is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- ☐ Claim(s) 1-19 and 22-24 is/are rejected.
- ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction or election requirement.

Application Papers

- ☐ See the attached Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review, PTO-948.
- ☐ The proposed drawing correction, filed on _____ is ☐ approved ☐ disapproved.
- ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are objected to by the Examiner.
- ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119 (a)-(d)

- ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d).
 - ☐ All ☐ Some* ☐ None of the CERTIFIED copies of the priority documents have been received.
 - ☐ received in Application No. (Series Code/Serial Number) _____.
 - ☐ received in this national stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 1.7.2(a)).

*Certified copies not received: _____

Attachment(s)

- ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s), PTO-1449, Paper No(s). _____
- ☒ Notice of References Cited, PTO-892
- ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review, PTO-948
- ☐ Interview Summary, PTO-413
- ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application, PTO-152
- ☐ Other _____

Office Action Summary

Art Unit: 3747

Claims 20-21 and 25 are withdrawn from further consideration by the examiner, 37 CFR 1.142(b), as being drawn to a non-elected species, the requirement having been traversed in Paper No. 9.

In particular, the flow resistance device (30d) is only shown as a part of Figure 1 which is the nonelected embodiment.

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless --

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

Claims 1-2, 10-11, 18-20 and 23-24 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Rembold et al ('885).

In particular, the applicant should see figure 5 of the reference.

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 12-13, 16 and 17 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Rembold.

Art Unit: 3747

In particular, injection time is always related to quantity so it would always be obvious to use this as an input to the increased fuel quantity desired. Engine speed is also always used to determine quantity. Finally, a variable resistor is commonly used to vary the speed of an electric motor.

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 3-6 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Rembold ('895) in view of Yoshihara.

Rembold applies as noted above and Yoshihara teaches using increased output from a low pressure pump at starting to purge vapor from the system. Since Rembold teaches a pump with overspeed capability this would have been obvious as well.

Because both systems are direct injection fuel systems with two levels of pump input it would have been obvious to use the higher capacity at starting to purge vapor from the Rembold system.

Claims 7-9 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Rembold as applied to claim 1 above, and further in view of Tuckey.

Tuckey teaches increasing fuel capacity from a pump when the fuel temperature goes up in order to compensate for density changes in the fuel.

Serial Number 298,926


Page 4

Art Unit: 3747

It would have been obvious to vary low pressure pump output using this input since there is always a drop in density at higher temperatures.

The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

C. MILLER:LM
SEPTEMBER 07, 2000
(703) 308-2653


Carl S. Miller
Primary Examiner